



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,097	11/17/2003	Kimito Uemura	117790	2230

25944 7590 04/21/2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER

ROSEN, NICHOLAS D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3625

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,097

Applicant(s)

UEMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas D. Rosen

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 20 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 20 and 21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claims 1-16, 20, and 21 have been examined

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, and 6

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krichilsky et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0152200) in view of Lyons et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0077937). As per claim 1, Krichilsky discloses a method for providing an electronic shop using a network, the method comprising: a step of transmitting information in order to solicit a purchase will of a user via a network (paragraphs 37, 38, 51, 52, 57, and 58); a step of receiving purchase

information indicative of a purchase will of the user via the network (paragraphs 69 and 71; Figure 10); and a step of transmitting information about an out-of-stock status of the commodity to the terminal of the user having transmitted purchase information via the network in response to received purchase information when the quantity of stock of the commodity is below a given quantity (paragraphs 72 and 78). Krichilsky does not expressly disclose a step of calculating a quantity of stock of the commodity in response to received purchase information by way of a computer, but Lyons teaches this (paragraph 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to calculate a quantity of stock of the commodity in response to received purchase information by way of a computer, for the stated advantage of enabling a web site or other sales channel to be updated.

As per claim 6, Krichilsky discloses that the electronic shop can be run on a website (paragraph 39).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krichilsky and Lyons as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Aichlmayr ("From Data to Delivery: Finding Fulfillment in E-Business"). Krichilsky mentions the use of electronic shopping carts (paragraph 4), but does not expressly disclose that purchase information indicative of the purchase is transmitted from the terminal of the user when the commodity is placed into an electronic shopping cart. However, Aichlmayr teaches that, "When a customer puts an item in a shopping cart, the retailer's site contacts the PFSWeb system and indicates whether or not the product is in stock." (Paragraph beginning, "When a customer puts an item"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have purchase information indicative of the purchase be transmitted from the terminal of the user when the commodity was placed into an electronic shopping cart, for the stated advantage of determining whether the item to be purchased was in stock.

Claims 3 and 5

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krichilsky et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0152200) in view of Lyons et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0077937), Butler et al. ("Gupta SQLBase Server for NetWare"), and official notice. As per claim 3, Krichilsky discloses a method for providing an electronic shop using a network, the method comprising: a step of transmitting information in order to solicit a purchase will of a user via a network (paragraphs 37, 38, 51, 52, 57, and 58); and a step of receiving purchase information indicative of a purchase will of the user via the network (paragraphs 69 and 71; Figure 10). Krichilsky does not expressly disclose a step of calculating a quantity of stock of the commodity in response to received purchase information by way of a computer, but Lyons teaches this (paragraph 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to calculate a quantity of stock of the commodity in response to received purchase information by way of a computer, for the stated advantage of enabling a web site or other sales channel to be updated.

Krichilsky does not expressly disclose detecting whether or not the quantity of stock of the commodity becomes below a first given quantity by a computer, nor does

Art Unit: 3625

Krichilsky disclose transmitting information indicating that the quantity of stock of the commodity becomes below the given quantity to the terminal of the manager of merchandise via the network when it is detected that the quantity of stock of the commodity becomes below the first given quantity for the first time since a given time, but Butler teaches automatically notifying a manager when stock is too low (paragraph beginning "Remote Procedure Calls (RPCs) can be made from SQL server"), which can be taken as notifying a manager when the quantity of stock of the commodity becomes below the first given quantity for the first time since a given time, since if notification were sent *whenever* the stock of the commodity were too low, troublesome consequences would ensue, such as continuously e-mailing the manager. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to detect whether or not the quantity of stock of the commodity became below a first given quantity by a computer, and transmit information indicating that the quantity of stock of the commodity became below the given quantity to the terminal of the manager of merchandise via the network when it was detected that the quantity of stock of the commodity became below the first given quantity for the first time since a given time, for the obvious advantage of causing managers to maintain stocks of commodities at adequate levels.

Neither Krichilsky nor Butler teaches transmitting the information only when it is detected that the quantity of stock becomes below the first given quantity for the first time since a given time, but official notice is taken that it is well known to transmit information, sound an alarm, or something similar only when a condition is detected for

Art Unit: 3625

the first time since a given time, or a reset. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to transmit the information only when it is detected that the quantity of stock becomes below the first given quantity for the first time since a given time, for the obvious advantage of avoiding redundant or distracting warnings.

As per claim 5, Butler teaches that transmission to the terminal of the manager is executed by electronic mail (paragraph beginning "Remote Procedure Calls (RPCs) can be made from SQL server"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for transmission to the terminal of the manager to be executed by electronic mail, for the obvious advantage of conveniently providing information to the manager wherever the manager might be.

Claims 3, 4, and 5 (second rejection)

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krichilsky et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0152200) in view of Lyons et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0077937), Nowers et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0033205), and official notice. Krichilsky discloses a method for providing an electronic shop using a network, the method comprising: a step of transmitting information in order to solicit a purchase will of a user via a network (paragraphs 37, 38, 51, 52, 57, and 58); and a step of receiving purchase information indicative of a purchase will of the user via the network (paragraphs 69 and 71; Figure 10). Krichilsky does not expressly disclose a step of calculating a quantity of stock of the commodity in response to received purchase information by way of a computer, but

Lyons teaches this (paragraph 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to calculate a quantity of stock of the commodity in response to received purchase information by way of a computer, for the stated advantage of enabling a web site or other sales channel to be updated.

Krichilsky does not expressly disclose detecting whether or not the quantity of stock of the commodity becomes below a first given quantity by a computer, nor does Krichilsky disclose transmitting information indicating that the quantity of stock of the commodity becomes below the given quantity to the terminal of the manager of merchandise via the network when it is detected that the quantity of stock of the commodity becomes below the first given quantity for the first time since a given time, but Nowers teaches automatically notifying a manager when stock is too low, at agreed upon times (paragraph 92), which can be taken as notifying a manager when the quantity of stock of the commodity becomes below the first given quantity for the first time since a given time, since if notification were sent *whenever* the stock of the commodity were too low, troublesome consequences would ensue, such as continuously e-mailing the manager; furthermore, "at agreed upon times" suggests notifying a manager when the quantity of the stock falls below a minimum level for the first time since a given time, since if the agreed upon time were, for example 8:00 AM, and notification were sent each morning at 8:00 AM, it would presumably be to say that the level of the stock had fallen below the minimum since the previous day's notifications. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of

Art Unit: 3625

electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to detect whether or not the quantity of stock of the commodity became below a first given quantity by a computer, and transmit information indicating that the quantity of stock of the commodity became below the given quantity to the terminal of the manager of merchandise via the network when it was detected that the quantity of stock of the commodity became below the first given quantity for the first time since a given time, for the stated advantage of causing more of the commodity to be supplied.

Neither Krichilsky, Lyons, nor Nowers teaches transmitting the information only when it is detected that the quantity of stock becomes below the first given quantity for the first time since a given time, but official notice is taken that it is well known to transmit information, sound an alarm, or something similar only when a condition is detected for the first time since a given time, or a reset. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to transmit the information only when it is detected that the quantity of stock becomes below the first given quantity for the first time since a given time, for the obvious advantage of avoiding redundant or distracting warnings.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krichilsky et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0152200), Lyons et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0077937), Nowers et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0033205), and official notice as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Butler et al. ("Gupta SQLBase Server for NetWare"). As per claim 4, Krichilsky does not expressly disclose that a computer detects whether or not the

Art Unit: 3625

quantity of stock of the commodity becomes below a smaller second quantity than the first given quantity and every time the computer detects that the quantity of stock becomes below the second given quantity, information that the quantity of stock becomes below the second given quantity is transmitted to the terminal of the manager of the merchandise, but Butler discloses automatically notifying a manager when an inventory becomes too low (paragraph beginning "Remote Procedure Calls (RPCs) can be made from SQL server"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have information that the quantity of stock became below the second given quantity be transmitted to the terminal of the manager of the merchandise, for the obvious advantage of quickly notifying the manager when the quantity of the stock had fallen to an excessively low level.

As per claim 5, Butler teaches that transmission to the terminal of the manager is executed by electronic mail (paragraph beginning "Remote Procedure Calls (RPCs) can be made from SQL server"). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for transmission to the terminal of the manager to be executed by electronic mail, for the obvious advantage of conveniently providing information to the manager wherever the manager might be.

Claims 7-12

Claim 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlsh ("Technology (Worth Watching): Point Made for Smaller Shops") in view of

Art Unit: 3625

Matsumoto (Japanese Published Patent Application 2000-305617). As per claim 7, Charlish discloses computers by which managers can obtain reports about stock levels, implying receiving information demanding transmission of stock management information, and transmitting the requested stock management information (paragraph beginning "Smaller retail outlets"). Matsumoto teaches a computer calculating a quantity of stock of a commodity based upon received data concerning the fluctuation of the quantity of the stock (English language Abstract), which implies receiving information about the quantity of the stock. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to receive this information and calculate a quantity of stock, for the obvious advantage of informing managers of the quantity of stock on hand, and enabling them to take appropriate actions.

As per claim 8, Matsumoto teaches that a quantity of stock is calculated by adding the received fluctuation of the quantity of stock to a quantity of stock preceding the received fluctuation (English language Abstract). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have a quantity of stock calculated by adding the received fluctuation of the quantity of stock to a quantity of stock preceding the received fluctuation, for the obvious advantage of determining a quantity of stock without having to count from scratch each time.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlish and Matsumoto as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Nowers et al. (U.S.

Patent Application Publication 2003/0033205); claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlish, Matsumoto and Nowers as applied to claim 9, and further in view of Butler ("Gupta SQLBase Server for NetWare"). Claims 9 and 10 are closely parallel to one element of claim 3, and claim 4, respectively, and rejected using Nowers and Butler for essentially the reasons set forth above with regard to claims 3-5 (second set of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlish, Matsumoto, Nowers and Butler as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Krichilsky et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0152200). Charlish does not disclose that when the quantity of stock is below the second given quantity, information indicative of an out-of-stock of the commodity is transmitted to a terminal of a user in response to information about a purchase will of the commodity sent from the terminal of the user, but Krichilsky teaches this when a commodity is out of stock (paragraphs 72 and 76-79). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have information indicative of an out-of-stock of the commodity be transmitted to a terminal of a user in response to information about a purchase will of the commodity sent from the terminal of the user, for the obvious advantages of avoiding the embarrassments consequent upon selling what one does not have, and to profit from the sale of alternative commodities, or the sale of the desired commodity at a later time, as taught by Krichilsky.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Charlish and Matsumoto as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Aichlmayr ("From

Data to Delivery: Finding Fulfillment in E-Business"). Charlish does not disclose checking whether or not the quantity of stock has reached zero, and (1) transmitting information about the commodity to a terminal of a user (customer) when the quantity of stock is not zero, and halting transmission of information when the quantity of stock has reached zero, but Aichlmayr teaches this (whole article for (1), and especially the paragraph beginning, "For Returns, end customers contact Gear.com customer service" for (2)). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to carry out the recited procedure, for the stated advantage of avoiding processing an order one cannot fill (while profiting from the sale of products available to be sold).

Claims 13-16

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krichilsky et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0152200). As per claim 13, Krichilsky discloses a method for providing an electronic shop using a network, comprising: a step of storing merchandise information about a plurality of commodities and various kinds of measures to be executed by a computer when a quantity of stock of a commodity becomes below a given quantity onto a memory (paragraphs 40 and 41 for memory; paragraphs 72-79 for various measures to be executed); and a step to execute a measure applied to the commodity by the computer when the quantity of stock of the quantity becomes below the given quantity (paragraphs 72 and 76-79). Determining whether a commodity is unavailable necessarily implies detecting a quantity of stock of that commodity, and apparently implies "a step to store a measure

set for each of the commodities onto the memory with linkage of the measure to the commodity.”

As per claim 15, Krichilsky discloses presenting information indicative of an out-of-stock status together with merchandise information (paragraphs 72 and 76-79).

Claims 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krichilsky et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0152200) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Aichlmayr (“From Data to Delivery: Finding Fulfillment in E-Business”). As per claim 14, Krichilsky does not disclose that the measure is to halt providing merchandise information, but Aichlmayr teaches this (paragraph beginning, “For returns, end customers contact Gear.com customer service”). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant’s invention for the measure to be to halt providing merchandise information, for the stated advantage of avoiding processing an order one cannot fill.

As per claim 16, Krichilsky does not disclose that the measure is to exclude the commodity from a target of a merchandise search, but Aichlmayr teaches making out-of-stock products invisible to end users, which necessarily implies excluding them from the target of a merchandise search (paragraph beginning, “For returns, end customers contact Gear.com customer service”). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant’s invention for the measure to be to exclude the commodity from a target of a merchandise search, for the stated advantage of avoiding processing an order one cannot fill.

Claims 20-21

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krichilsky et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0152200) in view of Lyons et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0077937). Krichilsky discloses a method for providing an electronic shop using a network, the method comprising: a step of transmitting information in order to solicit a purchase will of a user via a network (paragraphs 37, 38, 51, 52, 57, and 58); a step of receiving purchase information indicative of a purchase will of the user via the network (paragraphs 69 and 71; Figure 10); and a step of transmitting information advising an advance order for the commodity to the terminal of the user via the network in response to received purchase information when a quantity of stock of the commodity is below a given quantity (paragraphs 72 and 77). Krichilsky does not expressly disclose a step of calculating a quantity of stock of the commodity in response to received purchase information, but Lyons teaches this (paragraph 4). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to calculate a quantity of stock of the commodity in response to received purchase information, for the stated advantage of enabling a web site or other sales channel to be updated.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krichilsky and Lyons as applied to claim 20 above, and further in view of Gupta et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0074349). Krichilsky does not disclose that information indicating an expected available date of the commodity is transmitted to the terminal of the user, but Gupta teaches this (Abstract; paragraphs 23 and 33). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the

time of applicant's invention to have information indicating an expected available date of the commodity be transmitted to the terminal of the user, for the stated advantage of avoiding the loss of business efficiency, profits, and ultimate demise (paragraph 2 of Gupta), and the obvious advantage of profiting from selling currently out-of-stock commodities that will be available within a reasonable period of time.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed February 23, 2005, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues with respect to claims 1 and 20, that Krichilsky is not related to stock management, and does not disclose monitoring the quantity of stock. Examiner replies that Krichilsky is very much concerned with providing an electronic shop using a network (to quote the preamble of claim 1), and in order to accomplish this, determines whether selected products are available, which inherently implies some monitoring of the quantity of stock (although possibly not beyond the level of monitoring whether the quantity is zero or nonzero). Applicant further argues that neither Krichilsky nor Lyons discloses a step of transmitting information about an out-of-stock status of the commodity in response to received purchase information when the quantity of stock of the commodity is below a given quantity. Examiner replies that Krichilsky does disclose this (see paragraphs 72 and 78), at least interpreting "received purchase information" as information that a customer wishes to purchase something, and the "given quantity" as one item, or possibly enough items to fulfill an order. Applicant argues that Krichilsky does not disclose any

calculation of the quantity of the stock; Examiner replies that this is true, at least if one does not regard determining whether the quantity is or is not zero as a calculation, but Lyons teaches such a calculation.

Regarding claim 3, Applicant argues that the prior art relied upon does not disclose transmitting information indicating that the quantity of stock of a commodity becomes below the given quantity to the terminal of a manager of merchandise via the network only when it is detected that the quantity of stock becomes below the first given quantity for the first time since a given time. Examiner agrees that the prior art of record does not disclose this (with emphasis on the only), but took official notice, in response to Applicant's amendment, that it is well known to transmit information, sound an alarm, or something similar only when a condition is detected for the first time since a given time, or a reset.

Regarding claim 7, Applicant argues that Charlish and Matsumoto do not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited, since Charlish does not disclose when the reports are obtained, and Matsumoto does not disclose that the update data is obtained through a network. In response to Applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Charlish discloses a network, by disclosing entering data and obtaining reports from personal computers, based on data from point-of-sale terminals connected to files. Matsumoto discloses calculating a quantity of stock

of a commodity based upon received data concerning the fluctuation of the quantity of the stock, and, as set forth above in the rejection of claim 7, there is motivation to make the combination, for the advantage of informing managers of the quantity of stock on hand, and enabling them to take appropriate actions, which is suggested if not expressly set forth in the references applied.

Claim 13 is similar to claims 1 and 20. Applicant argues for its allowability by criticizing the Krichilsky reference, as Applicant did in arguing for the patentability of claims 1 and 20. Examiner reiterates his response, and maintains the rejection of claim 13, much as he maintains the rejections of claims 1 and 20.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Stone et al. (U.S. Patent 6,446,045) disclose a method for using computers to facilitate and control the creating of a plurality of functions. McCaslin (U.S. Patent 6,868,397) discloses an equipment information system and method. Lucas (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0230503) discloses an inventory control system and methods. Allen et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0260722) disclose a web address converter for dynamic web pages (see paragraph 140 for tracking inventory and ordering "in-stock" items in real time).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen whose telephone number is 571-272-6762. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on 571-272-7159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 703-746-5574.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 3625

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas D. Rosen

NICHOLAS D. ROSEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

April 15, 2005